

REMARKS/ARGUMENTSDrawing Objection

The Examiner objected to Figure 1 being a hand drawn drawing. A non-hand drawn Figure 1 is hereby submitted.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, all the claim limitations must be taught by the prior art and there must be some suggestion or motivation for the combination of references. MPEP §2142.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aarnio (US 6,522,889) in view of Watanabe (US 5,528,293). And, Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aarnio (US 6,522,889) in view of Kim (US 6,278,884).

The Office Action states that Aarnio does not explicitly disclose preparing the acquired image and that Watanabe discloses compressing the image of an object to a JPEG format. Kim discloses a panic button. Aarnio, Watanabe and Kim do not disclose addressing. Independent claims 1, 8, 10, 15, 17 and 22 have been amended to add addressing which is not taught in the cited references. Depending claims 2, 9, 11 and 16 have been amended to preserve consistency with the amendments made to their respective independent claims.

For these reasons at least, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-22 define a patentably distinct invention, and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection based on Aarnio in view of Watanabe and based on Aarnio in view of Kim is kindly requested.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 8, 2006

By: /Andrea L. Mays/
Andrea L. Mays
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,721

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-2779
Telephone: (858) 651-8546
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502